

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-14

Major Part B. for July 98

Permission in favour of Hyder Shih Toaddy Vnd Farmer
 of Sayemamangla Circle Chowdell Sub Taluk for 1892-93

Contents

811. From the Enisee banner in Chysoe
 No 2057 dt 30-10-95-

181
 From a copy of communication from the S.C.
 Bangalore dt together with the copy of Revenue
 Statement for Rs 3 16-12-0 being irrecoverable
 balance due by Hyder Shih, Toaddy Vnd Farmer
 and recommends that the same may be

settled after accounts.

Sl 2 G. R. J. 68 dt 7-10-95
 No 4508
 GPB-4.000-47.11
 With reference to the above requests that the
 entire record together with the correspondence
 subsequent to 13th July 1894

Tables of contents

- Sl 3 From M. Hyder Sahib Toddy & and Farmer & Cooper.
Petn No 1686 of 4-11-95
Appeals against the order of the S.C. Bangalore
Dtt and prays that orders may be issued
to him to pay up his arrears, and that
his properties may be redeemed on the
Cancellation of the sale
- Sl 4. To the Excise Commr in Mysore
No 4613 of 12-11-95
Gm 138 Forwards the petition No 1686
referred to in the above, with the entire doc
connected with it for report -
- Sl 5 From the Excise Commr in Mysore
No 5228 of 16-6-96
Submits⁵⁹ copy of correspondence from the
S.C. Bangalore Dtt, together with the records
relating to the Emission recommended in
favor of Hyder Sahib, Toddy & and Farmer
- Sl 6 To the Excise Commissioner in Mysore
No 3500 of 28-2-1896
Gm 128 Requests him to report whether the purchasers
of the properties referred to in the D.C. orders
have been put in possession of them and if
not what is the existing state of things
- Sl 7 From the Excise Commissioner in Mysore
No 3960 of 22-1-97
Reports²⁷³ on the allegations contained in the

Tables of contents -

the petition of defaulting Toddy V&nd Farmer
Hyder Sahib, together with the entire record
to the Excise Commr in Mysore

Sl 8

no 6952

Dt 3-2-27

Requests ^{EX 274} that - the further report - called
for may be obtained & submitted as early
as possible.

Sl 9.

From the Excise Commr in Mysore

no 2148

Dt 6-2-27

285 Requests the records relating
to the case of Hyder Sahib Nayak
returned as the D.C. Bangalore & it
wants them for reference.

Sl 10

To the Excise Commr in Mysore

no 7297

Dt 12-2-27

EX 288

Returns the records referred
to in the above

Sl 11

From the Excise Commr in Mysore

no 2628

Dt 8-2-1897

Submits ²⁵ further report - in the case of
Hyder Sahib Toddy V&nd Farmer
charged - Sub - Table

Sl 12.

To the Excise Commr in Mysore

No 7222-3

Dt 1-2-27

Sanctions ^{EX 26} the Cancellation of the Sale
referred to in the above and requests the
Commr to ascertain the extent of loss

Tables of contents

Loss Sustained by the petitioners and to
submit a remission statement -

Sl 13. From the Enquire banner in Mysore
NO 8838
543
of 28-6-98

Submit a remission statement received
from the D.C. Bangalore dt for Rs 786/14/-,
being the amount of actual loss reported
to have been sustained by Hydar Subit
Toddy Vind Farmer of 604/1 - Sub Gales

Sl 14. To the En. banner of the Comptroller
NO 2556
Ex 20
of 11-7-28

States that the sum of Rs 786-12-0
above referred to will be written off the
accounts

Indexed

Banaji Wajurajee
12th May 1964

Subject

Remission of Rs 344-12-0 in favor
of one Hyder Sabi, Loddz, vend

SECTION	57
FILE No.	157th/892-93
SERIAL No.	Year 1892-93.

Last Reference The Excise Commr
2057-1818/24/11/95
in his letter no 5228 dated 16/6/95

June 1896 recommends remission
of Rs 344-12-0 in favor of
Hyder Sab as proposed by the
Dy. Commr, Bangalore District

one Hyder Sab obtained
the Loddz Izara of the Syana-
mangala Firka, Chispet Taluq,
for the year 1892-93 for a monthly
rental of Rs 103-1-0 or for an
annual amount of Rs 1236-12
including local cess.

The farm had 3 shops:-

- (1) Syanamangala shop
- (2) Guddahalli "
- (3) Malapanhalli "

and the groves attached to it
as per mutchhalika were:-

- (1) Banigere Grove
- (2) Guddahalli "
- (3) Malapanhalli

months after he took up the farm, Hyder sab complained to the Dy. Commr, Bangalore District that no shop could be opened at Guddahalli as it was an uninhabited village, that the Malaganhalli shop was not opened as the Bidadi Farm Contractor did not permit him to tap trees in the Banigere vanam and that even the sales in the Syanamangala shop (which is the only shop opened by the farmer) were considerably affected by the close proximity of another shop of the Xankanhalli Taluq which was opened ^{at a spot} only ~~half~~ a furlong distant from his shop, and prayed that his case might be enquired into and orders passed.

The petition was referred to the Excise Asstt Commr for enquiry and a local enquiry was made by the Sddy Inspector of the Range and some arrangements were made by which Hyder sab was allowed 30 trees ~~and~~, but it would appear from the records that Hyder sab paid Rs 30/- for having utilized those trees.

At the close of the contract Hyder sab became a defaulter to the extent of Rs 786-12 for which amount he & his security were both served with notices of demand.

paper marked (2) in the file.

paper marked H.

As the Vaddy farmer, was trying to evade payment of arrears, the District Excise & Salt Commissioner issued an order on the 27th April 1893 directing the attachment of the defaulters properties which were situated in the Hunkanhalli Taluq. The properties were accordingly attached and the matter reported to the Dy Commr. The sale proclamation not having been signed by Hydersab in proof of his presence at the time of attachment of such properties, an explanation was called for from the Amildar and the Amildar reported that the said Hydersab refused to sign the proclamation and in support of the statement he also submitted the statement obtained by the residents of the place and also that obtained by Hydersab himself. An order was thereupon sent that the properties should be sold and the fact duly reported for confirmation of ~~such~~ ^{the} sales. The properties were accordingly sold on the 30th December 1893 and a report made to that effect by the Amildar of Hunkanhalli.

papers i.e. sale lists,
marked in red pencil
1 & 11

In the meanwhile

ceived by the Dy. Commr. Bangalore note:—

(1) Noorbee wife of Hydersab represented that lands survey nos 134, 130 & 133 and a house in the Madenhalli village all belonged to her as her Mahal property & that they should not therefore be attached in satisfaction of arrears due from her husband on account of Loddys Contract.

(C) 2

(2) One Seshappa stated that lands survey nos 40 & 42 had been sold to him in 1880.

(d)

(3) One Hutchi (Hydersab's concubine) claimed that the house at Madenhalli was given to her by Hyder sab.

On the receipt of the above complaints summons were ^{issued} ~~served~~ to ~~all the~~ Hyder sab & all other parties concerned to appear before the Dy. Commr. An elaborate ~~and~~ enquiry was held and the Dy. Commr. passed the following order on the 13th July 1894:—

paper marked \$

"That the allegation of Hyder sab (Contractor) that he could work but one shop in his Farka, is groundless and that the Izaradar himself is to blame for having raised the Gulta amount to 103-1 per mensem while the farm could ^{not} fetch ~~not~~ more than Rs 65 a month as deposed by some local men.

That the properties claimed by Noor-bee (Hyderab's wife) and Seshappa should be released as they made out their cases. As Hutehi could not make her claim good, her application should be rejected.

That the sale proceeds of the remaining properties amounting to Rs 442-⁰⁰-⁰⁰ should be credited towards the arrears, and that the balance still due viz Rs 254-12 be recommended for remission.

The recommendation for remission of Rs 254-12 was subject to the receipt of a joint-report called for from the Amildars of Chennarayana & Cholepet. In the above order, as, at the time of enquiry, some discrepancy was observed as to the exact amount due by the defaulter.

The joint-report submitted by the two Amildars in accordance with the ab Dy. Commr's order showed that all the payments made by Hyder sab as per Treasury account amounted to Rs 450/- and that the discrepancy observed was owing to certain ^{viz 50/- + 40/-} entries having been ~~made~~

paper marked H,

~~each~~ made twice by clerical mistake.

The exact amount due by the defaulter was therefore ~~then~~

ceived by the Dy. Commr. Bangalore note:—

(1) Noorbee wife of Hydersab represented that lands survey nos. 134, 130 & 133 and a house in the Madenhalli village all belonged to her as her mahal property & that they should not therefore be attached in satisfaction of arrears due from her husband on account of Loddy Contract.

(c) 2

(2) One Seshappa stated that lands survey nos. 40 & 42 had been sold to him in 1880.

(d)

(3) One Hutchi (Hydersab's concubine) claimed that the house at Madenhalli was given to her by Hyder sab.

On the receipt of the above complaints summons were ^{issued} ~~sent~~ to ~~all the~~ Hyder sab & all other parties concerned to appear before the Dy. Commr.

~~An elaborate and long enquiry~~ was held and the Dy. Commr. passed the following order on the 13th July 1894:—

paper marked \$

"That the allegation of Hyder sab (Contractor) that he could work but one shop in his Firkā, is groundless and that the Dzaradar himself is to blame for having raised the Gulta amount to 103-1 per mensem while the farm could ^{not} fetch ~~more~~ more than Rs 65 a month as deposited by some local men.

That the properties claimed by
Hoorbee (Hyderab's wife) and
Leshappa should be released
as they made out their cases, & as
Hutehi could not make her claim
good, her application should be
rejected.

That the sale proceeds of the
remaining properties amounting
to Rs 442-~~00~~ should be credited
towards the arrears, and that the
balance still due viz Rs 254-12
be recommended for remission.

The recommendation for remission
of Rs 254-12 was subject to the
receipt of a joint-report called for
from the Amildars of Chennarayana & Chennarayana
in the above order, as, at the time of
enquiry, some discrepancy was
observed as to the exact amount
due by the defaulter.

The joint-report submitted
by the two Amildars in accordance
with the ab Dy. Commr's order showed
that all the payments made by
Hyderab as per Treasury account
amounted to Rs 450/- and that
the discrepancy observed was owing
to certain ^{viz 50/- & 40/-} ~~as~~ entries having been ~~made~~

paper marked A,

~~each~~ made twice by clerical mistake.

The exact amount due by the
defaulter was therefore ~~then~~

Idara amount

for the year 1892-93. — Rs 1236-12-"

all payments made. " 450

Balance Rs 786-12-"

The sale proceeds of

properties ————— 442- " —

The balance still due is Rs 344-12-".

on the 18th January 1894 after the properties of Hydersab were sold, some of the inhabitants of Madenhalli and Badesabi Doldi Villages of the Kankanhalli Taluq petitioned that the properties of Hydersab were not sold at their market values and in the places mentioned in the sale proclamation. They consequently prayed that the ~~properties~~^{sale} might be conducted again ~~referred~~ by another revenue officer. An order was thereon issued calling on the petitioners to appear before the Dy. Commr on the 10th February 1894.

The Dy. Commr again issued an order to the Amildar of Kankanhalli Taluq on the 22nd September/94 directing the submission of a report ~~engaging~~ on the following points:—

- (1) The Result of the enquiry into the complaint made by the inhabitants of the Madenhalli village.
- (2) What right had the defaulter to properties not in his Khate.
- (3) Whether the Amildar considered the prices for which properties ^{were} sold, fair?

papers marked K & K,

all the places mentioned
in the sale proclamation

paper marked R.

Report dated 19th November 194
from the Amildar in reply to
to the above order runs as follows:

- (1) With regard to point (1) raised
in the above order, ~~say that~~ no
enquiry was held into the
complaint in his taluq.
- (2) Though the ~~plot~~ properties,
were not in Hydersab's ~~share~~,
they were in his enjoyment
from a long time & that no
objection was taken by any
body as will be seen from the sale
list to which the residents of the
village have fixed their signatures.
- (3) The Amildar Honnappa Naik
conducted the sale in a place
equally distant from all the
~~plot~~ lands as agreed to by the
inhabitants and that they have
signed the sale list in proof of
their consent. The prices seem
to be fair ~~as~~ ^{also} no objection
was taken by the purchasers
& residents present either at
the time of sale or ^{soon} after.

With regard to the point one (1)
viz the result of enquiry held

has recorded the following ~~following~~
~~order~~ remark ^{on the 5th March 195} on the sale list
marked (C) ~~as the 5th March 195~~

" The objection seems frivolous.
There is no reason ^{to think} that Hinnappa naidu
did not sell the properties properly
or for prices ~~below~~ the market value.
The sale is confirmed "

There are two or 3 applications
on the file received from the
purchasers praying that they
might be ~~placed~~ placed in possession of
the properties purchased.
What further step was taken on
these applications cannot be made
out in the records now received

papers made

The Dy Commr recommended that
the balance still due by the defaulter
viz Rs 344-12 might be remitted
as he had already suffered much loss
and the Excise Commr supports
the recommendation in his letter
of 16th June 1895 under disposal:
01/2/11/95

In the meantime, Hyder sab
presented an appeal ~~petition~~
on the 4th November 1895 in which
he says that the order passed
by the Dy Commr in his case
was based on a very superficial
enquiry made by him and
prays that it ~~be~~ ^{might} be cancelled
and he be allowed to dispose of the properties to his
best advantage and pay up the amount due to Govt.

The appeal is preferred
on the following grounds:-

Note The amount is specified
in the ~~for~~ sale notice.

- (1) That the sale proclamation did not contain a shara that the right ~~title~~ ^{interest} and interest only of the defaulter was to be sold for a definite amount of arrears.
- (2) The purchase money was not paid by purchasers in a fixed time.
- (3) The sale was not conducted at the spots mentioned in the sale proclamation.
- (4) That no notice was served on the Khatedars of properties.
- (5) The properties were sold for very low ~~prices~~ sums in collusion of the Lddy Inspector with the purchasers.

In regard to the allegation no (2) no information is forthcoming in the records, nor is there any thing to show ~~that~~ ^{that} the purchasers ^{were} ~~are~~ put in possession of the ~~properties~~ ^{properties}.

Note A report will, if approved, be called for on this point.

The other ~~grounds~~ points are disposed of by the Dy. Commr as will be seen in the memo.

The above petition was referred
to the Excise Commr for a report
& submission of the entire record
connected with the case and the
whole record was accordingly
submitted for orders. But neither the
Dy Commr nor the Excise Commr
~~has~~ has made any remark with reference
to the allegations made in the ^{appeal} petition.

The question is whether the Dy
Commr's order should be considered
final or the question should be
~~re~~ reopened with reference to
the appeal preferred by the Hyder sabi,
and if the ~~former~~ ^{in the former case,} orders are solicited
~~on the recommendation for the remission~~
of Rs 344-12 in favour of the farmer

having regard to the facts that
the sale of Hyder Sabi's lands did
take place so far back as Decr 93
& the Dy Commr has gone
fully into the matter as
shown in his order marked A

Submitted for orders

78
14/9/96

The allegation no 2 does
not concern the ^{case} in any
way. The other points have
been satisfactorily explained.
Dy Commr's order sanctioning remission
& reflecting Dy Commr's appeal
15/9

Dy Commr's

BB

19/9/96

Subd to be?

I would suggest an order to some such effect as the following

The Petr. Hyder Sab purchased the Toddy Vend Farm of the Hyanamangala Circle for 1892-93. He contends that, out of the 3 shops attached to the Circle, one was situated in the beehive village of fuddahalli and has therefore to be kept closed, that one Nanjundagowda prevented him from tapping the trees in the Banifere frone, and that the sale-proceedings for recovery of the arrears due from him were conducted irregularly.

The first of these contentions does not entitle the Petr. to any relief, as it was his own look-out to have ascertained the capabilities and defects of the Farm before he purchased it.

But the allegation that ~~Hyder Sab~~ Petr. was seriously handicapped by the opposition of Nanjundagowda is amply borne out by the facts. The Banifere frone was one that was attached to the Petr. own Farm his opponent was a man of means

Do the use of an
Official Order Form
by the Local Commission
if it is a
Council case?

Subd.

The sale complained of was not held for the realization of "Land Revenue". This does not therefore appear to be a Council case.

Please see clause (b) para 10 Rule II of Council Rules; Section 221 of the L. R. Code referred to therein; and the definition of "Land Revenue" given in Sec 249.

influence; and as stated by
the Dy Commr., neither the
Joddy Inspectors nor the
then Amildar did anything
to remove the Petro difficulties.
Such being the case, the Dy Commr's
summary disposal of the matter
with the remark that a more
powerful man in his place
would have managed better,
is hardly satisfactory.

The Govt. regret to observe
that no mention is made in the
Dy Commr's report about the al-
lows connected with the recovery
of the avars, — one main point
of the present appeal. It appears,
however, from the records that the price
fetches was considered fair, and that
the consent of the ~~villagers~~ villagers
was taken to hold the sale at a spot
equally distant from all the lands.
At the same time, whether or not
the purchase money was paid
in time does not affect the
question at issue.

On the whole, the Petr. seems
to have been ~~somehow~~ ^{somehow} unfortunate
in the working of his farm and have
been denied that assistance ~~that~~
from the local officials which he
had a right to expect.

~~The recommendation of P. D. 44/120~~
Before sanctioning the remission
recommended, the Dy Commr. will
be requested to report whether
the purchasers have been put
in possession of the properties sold, and
if so, why the sale should not
be cancelled and the Petr. allowed
to pay up the avars due from him.

Please call for
a report rather
allgo. b. in
the M. L. in
inquire who else
the purchase
has been
out in 7/17/96
The may deal 22/9/96
note the case after
the report is received
4

6/24/9

~~Draft Sub~~
#3

26/9/96

Memo Sub
in continuation

#3

25/9/97

In accordance with the Secretary's order dated 22nd ~~June~~ ^{Sept^r} ^{on the Dist^r Secty's note,} ~~May~~ 1896, the Excise Commr^y was asked in this office docket no. $\frac{3500}{ex 128}$ of 22/9/96, to submit a full report on the several allegations made by the petitioner Hyder Sabi, as also to report whether the purchasers were of Hyder Sabi's properties were put in possession & if not what was the ~~state~~ existing state of things. In reply, the Excise Commr^y in his letter no. $\frac{3960}{273}$ of 22nd January 1907, reports that the purchasers ~~are~~ have not been put in possession ~~and~~ ^{that} all the properties are still in the enjoyment of the petitioner and ~~as per~~ that, as per Sub-Division Officer's report, the petitioner is willing to pay up the ~~amount~~ ^{balance} due ~~from~~ ^{by} him provided the amount of his loss be remitted. With regard to the several allegations ~~are~~ made by the petitioner, it is further reported that

(1) as personally in-

Mr. Mr. Shujat Ali Khan, the
the petitioner suffered loss as he was
unable to manage the business
properly.

(2) that the ~~sale of~~ properties which
were in the enjoyment of the petitioner
~~were~~ were sold in satisfaction
of arrears but not subject to the
right title & interest of others.

(3) that properties were sold for
reasonable amounts viz Rs 442
of which 2346-12 was realized

and (4) that some of the purchasers
of the property are the petitioner's own
men and that all the ~~old~~ properties
~~are~~ still in the possession & enjoyment
of the petitioner, the assessment
thereof being paid by him. In
reporting the above details the Excise Commr.
promised a further report on ~~the~~
certain irregularities noticed in
the sale proceedings & accordingly
in his letter no. $\frac{2628}{125}$ of 8/9/97 now
under disposal, ~~he~~ states that the
^{confirmation of} sale conducted was irregular and suggests that
the properties may again be ordered
to be sold now if the defaulter
refuses to pay up the arrears; also submits copy of
memo drawn up by the Amildar of the
Kankanhalli Taluk in ~~also enclosed~~

Confirming

answers to the several queries
put by the Excise Com^{rs}.

Submitted with reference to
Secretary's order of 22nd September 196 of

Rule of R. 2d 12

In a case like this
Govt can only sell the
right, title and interest
of the defaulting vend
farmer. Then again,
the purchasers did not
pay the balance of
the purchase money
within the time fixed
on these grounds, the
sale is liable to be
set aside. I would
suggest that orders
be passed accordingly.

It is admitted that
Ryder sold foolishly
pay up the bid &
purchased the farm
for a much higher price
than it was worth. It
is likewise admitted
that both for this reason
and in consequence

of difficulties, thrown
in his way by our
Majorda Gowda &
reluctance the local
authorities, failed to
remove, Hyderabad
sustained a heavy
loss. The main power
may be asked to ascer-
tain the extent of
such loss, & to submit
a description statement
accordingly. For the
balance if any the
necessary proceedings
may be ordered to
be taken de novo.

Q

15/1/98

15-1-98

Approved

18-1-98

[Signature]

Discrepancy
type Q

19-1-98

Drafted

82

26/1/98

Note in continuation

As ordered above, The Excise
Commissioner was requested (in para 2
of Govt: Prop: No: 7112-3 dt 1st Feb 98)
to submit a remission statement
after ascertaining the extent of loss
sustained by H. des Sahab. In com-
pliance with this, The Excise Com-
missioner has now submitted
a remission statement for Rs 786-12-4.
A draft sanctioning the remission
is ^{herewith} submitted for approval or other
order.

83


6/7/98

Submitted

6/11/95

Exiso.]

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE



From

SECTION The Excise Commissioner in Mysore

FILE No. 159 1895-96

To Revenue

SERIAL No. The Secy. to the Govt. of Mysore

Dept.

Dated 30th

Despatched

Received

General No. 2051

No. 181

Enclosure No. (141 file)

In reply to

SUBJECT

Forwards copy of communication from the deputy commissioner Bangalore District, together with copy of Remission Statement for Rs 344-12-0 being the irrecoverable balance due by Hyder Sab, Toddy Tena Farmer of Sayanamangala circle, Closepet Sub Taluk for the year 1892-93; and recommends that the same may be written off the accounts.

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office.)

Submitted for order to the Rev. Secy. -

2. It is of primary importance that the complete file of orders from the Sale party of lands recorded to the last papers in the subject should be carefully got up & sent with the Re. mission statement. These papers have been called for.

6/11/95 J. P. A.

Call for the entire record collected with the correspondence which took place subsequently to 13th July 1904 regarding the discrepancy of Rs 140. It has been stated that no further assumption statements should be receivable accompanied by the entire verbal records from the commencement of the balance to the date of recommendation.

7/11/95

4/11/95

Excise Commissioners Office
No. 2051 (Enclt (file))
181 Bangalore, dated 30th October 1895
2-11

From.

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

To
The Revenue Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.

Sir,

In forwarding, herewith, copy
of the marginally noted correspondence,

1. Docket no 348, dated 6th June 1895,
from the Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore district.

2. Order dated 13th July 1894, passed
by the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore
district.

3. Docket no. 5384, dated $\frac{13}{15}$ June
1895, to ditto $\frac{2644}{}$

4. Docket no. 168, dated 29th October
1895 from — ditto —

together with a
copy of the Remission
Statement for
Rs 344-12-0
being the irrecoverable
balance due by
Hyder Saib, Taddy
Vend Farmer
of Syanamangala
circle in the Goseper

Sub-taluk, for the year 1892-93,
I have the honor to request that
under the circumstances explained
by the Deputy Commissioner of the
Bangalore District, the above amount
with interest up to date, may be
ordered to be written off the
accounts

accounts.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

Thicketts

Excise Commissioner

in Mysore

Statement showing the irrecoverable amount both arrears and current pecuni-
ation for 1892-93.

indeed for

[illegible]

The first order
 in the order
 dated 13th July 1874
 copy is here of
 is here to attached
 The in sent to
 As 52
 -9-6.

Barings and
Deputy Commissioner's Office
Crime Department

"Lobby"

Alfred J. W. Shandy.
 for Deputy Commissioner
 Theobald
 Excise Commissioners
 1st Maydon

SECTION	5A
From	FILE No. 157/1895-6
SERIAL No.	2

To

The Excise Commr.
in Mysore.

Dated

7th November 1895

Despatched

11

Received

General No.

4508

No.

Sm. 137.

Enclosure No.

This letter No: 2051 d/30/10/
181.
95 forwarding a remission state-
ment for Rs 3 24 11-4 being
the balance due by Hyderab
Daddy Kunt Farmer of florepet
Sub Taluk for 92/93

With reference to the above
has the honour to request that
the ^{entire} ~~whole~~ record together with
the correspondence subsequent
to the 13th July/94 regard;


regarding the discrepancy of Rs 140/-
may be called for and submitted,
and to point out that in future,
remission statements should
invariably be accompanied by
the entire vernacular record from
the ^{commencement} ~~commencement~~ of the lease
to the date of recommendation.

By Order,

C

7-11-95

Revenue Secretary


S. A. J.
7/11/95

Received

8/11 - 21. 1/11 - 8/11

up in this office sent to
being.

8/11/95 - 1. 8/11 -

SECTION	No. 1	1686
FILE No.	150	Name of Petitioner, M. Hyder Sale
SERIAL No.		Village, Syanamangala Firkha

Godly kind farmer of
Closepet Sub-3k

Taluk, Channarayana

District, Bangalore

Date of Arzi, 4-11-95

Date of Receipt, 5-11-95

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, nil

ABSTRACT.

Appearing against the order
of the Dy Commr., Bangalore Dist
regarding the sale of the Pet's
property for arrears of Godly
contract due for the year 1892-3

States that two of the vanam
bond
noted down in the contract, viz
Bannigeri and Goodhalli were
not given to him; that the
rates in some of his shops
were affected by clandestine
sales and ^{those} that of certain others
by other shops adjoining to
Pet's: that though the Pet's

Submitted to the P.W. Secy,
1. Arzi was sent
up without the V.R.
Records and the file
has been called for
yesterday. Being this
has sent to the Dy. Commr.
for inspection & the
Dy. Commr. for any observation
they may wish to make
when sending up
the V.R. Records called
for? 8/11/95 1. 8/11 -

This is a different
matter. Being an
appeal against a
sale and to have
been irregularly
conducted - call
for a report with
record - 11/11 -
3-11-95

represented his grievances to all the authorities in the Excise Deptth commencing from the Toddy Inspector, going up to the Dewan. No remedy was effected; and that the Pet's property was attached for an indefinite amount of arrears and sold in auction on 30th Dec^r 1893, no opportunity being given to the ~~amount~~ Pet^r to know how much was due by him to Gov^{ty}.

The appeal is ~~preff~~ preferred on the following grounds:-

- (i) That the sale proclamation did not contain a shara that the right title and interest of the defaulter was to be sold for a definite amount of arrears.
- (ii) That the purchase amount was not paid by purchasers in a fixed time. held
- (iii) That the sale was not ~~at~~ the spots mentioned in the proclamation.
- (iv) That no notices were issued to and served upon the Khatedars of the properties sold.
- (v) That the properties were sold for very low sums, the Toddy Inspector having colluded with the purchasers who were the bitterest enemies of the Pet^r.

Prays that on these grounds the appeal may be ~~preferred~~ ^{allonge} ~~that~~ and orders may be issued to allow the Pet^r to pay up his arrears, ~~the properties sold~~ and that his properties may be released on the cancellation of the sales.

(4)

SECTION	S. A.
FILE No.	15918956
SERIAL No.	4

To

The Dy. Commr.
in Mysore

Dated 12th November 1895-

Despatched 13

Received

General No. 4613

No. 138

Enclosure No. 1

Appeal Petition of Mr.
Sardar Sahib Laddu Vaid
Talukdar of Syamangala
Taluka Chikpete Sub Taluk
No 92/93 - Mysore No 1686
of 4th Nov 1895 - regarding
certain allegations
relative to irregularities committed
in the sale of his property
for arrears of P.W. as
ordered by the Dy. Commr.

Has the honor to forward
the above in original,
for report, with the entire
records connected with
the case - -


12-11-95

[Signature]
C. S. S.

11/11/95

P.W. Secy

3



From

*The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore*

SECTION SAFILE No. 150/1898 ToSERIAL No. 5

The Secy. to the Govt. of Mysore,

General & Revenue Depts.

Dated 16thDespatched 18th

Received

General No. 5228No. 597Enclosure No. 1 and a file of Record

In reply to

*Secretary's docket**No. 10818 dated the 12th instant.**Ex 343* SUBJECT

Remission

*Submits copy of communication
from the Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District, together
with the entire Record
relating to the remission
recommended in favor
of Hyder Sab, a Soddy
Vend Farmer in the Florepett
Sub-taluk for 1892-93.*

References (to be entered only in the
Dewan's Office.)

Plw 19.6.90

Subd to the Memo

14/9/90

Excise Commissioner's Office
No. 5228
Enc: 1 and a file 597 Bangalore, dated 16th June 1896
of Record. From.

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.
To The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.

Sir,

In reply to your docket
No. 10818, dated the 12th instant,
Ex 343
I have the honor to submit herewith
copy of docket No. 398, dated the
12th idem from the Deputy Commission
Bangalore District, together with
the entire record therewith received
relating to the remission recommended
in favor of Hyder Sab, a Foddy
Vend Farmer in the Closepett
Sub - taluk for 1892-93.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant
M. R. R. R.
Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

1896.

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.
Bangalore

Dated 13th June 1896.

No. A 398.

Enclosure / File

With reference to his official
Memorandum No. 2211 dated 12th
November 1895, has the honor to
forward, herewith as called for,
the entire record relating to the
remission of the amount of Rs 344-11-0
due by Hyder Saib together with
the correspondence subsequent to the
13th July 1894. A list of papers
contained in the record is enclosed
for reference.

(Signed) H. Anaji Rao
for Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore
"copy" M. Puruasha
Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

From

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
To The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

Dated $\frac{28}{30}$ th September 1896.

No. $\frac{3500}{Ex. 128}$

Enclosure No. 1 & file

In returning herewith,
petition registered No. 1686, da
5th November 1895, from Hyder
Sahi, defaulting Vend Farmer,
Chasepet Taluk, for 1892-93,
together with the entire records
received with his letter No.
 $\frac{2051}{181}$, dated 30th October 1895,
has the honor to request the Excise
Commissioner to be so good
as to submit at an early
date, a full report on the
several allegations made in
the Petition

The Excise Commissioner is
also

whether the purchasers of the properties referred to in the Deputy Commissioner's Order, dated 13/7/94 have been put in possession of them and if not, what is the existing state of things.

"By Order"
(Sd) Rama Ras.

For Secretary

86/7

72235
1642
Excise Commissioner's Office
Bangalore 1st October 1896

No. 2071
123 Enc: 1 file

Official Memorandum

Copy of the foregoing together with the entire records therewith received, is forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, with a request that an enquiry may be made into all the points alleged in Hyder Sahib's Petition & the result reported as early as possible, with other information required by Government.

Ec. Dept.

Bring up report
GMR 4/10

M. M. M. M. M.
Excise Commissioner
in Charge

Regd No 333 of 96/97

to a No. 183. E. 1 file

Forwarded in duplicate to the District Sub-Div. Officer for the needful enquiry & report at a very early date. 8-10-96

Date. 8-10-96

For Secretary
Rama Ras.
Sd.

Draft as per order
Lo

SECTION	59
FILE NO.	The Excise Commr. 6-9-1896
SERIAL NO.	6

in Mysore

3500 ✓

No 84.128⁴

Dated 28 September 1896
30 subfile.

In returning herewith
petition regd no 1686 dated
5th November 1895 from Hyder
Sabi, defaulting 5000, vend
Farmer, Chacepet Taluq, for 192-93
together with ^{the} entire records re-
ceived with his letter no 2051
dated 30th October 195, has the
honor to request the Excise
Commr will be so good
as to submit at an early
date a ^{full} report on the several
allegations made in the
petition. The Excise Commr is also
requested to report whether
~~all the allegations are~~
the purchasers of the properties
referred to in the ^{By Commr's order of 13/1/96} petition, have
been put in possession of
them

them and if not, ^{what is} ~~a detailed~~
~~report may be called for on~~
~~the existing state of things &~~
~~submitted to this office.~~

B.O.

28/9
for Secretary

A.D.

26/9/96

24/9/96

From

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To

The Secretary to Govt. of Mysore.

SECTION

General and Revenue Depts

FILE No.

15-9/1895-96

SERIAL No.

17

Dated

22nd Jan

1897

Despatched

26th

January

1897

Received

General No.

3960

No.

273

Enclosure

No. 241 file

Remman

In reply to Secretary's docket No. 6306

Ex 256

Dated the 16th instant
SUBJECT.

Repetition of the allegations contained
in the petition of defaulting
Taddy Tend Farmer Hyder
Said of Chospet Sub. Taluk for
1892-93, together with the entire
records.

Pls Det

References (to be entered only in the
Dewan's Office.)

Subd to the dwp

88

30/1/97

N^o. 3960 Cen 3.
273

Excise Commissioner's Office
Bangalore 22nd January 1897.

From.

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

To.

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

In reply to your docket No 6306
Ex 256
dated the 16th instant, I have the honor to
submit herewith, copy of docket No. 265,
dated the 6th idem, from the Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District together with the file of
Vernacular papers &c. therewith received, to
which is attached the Holopet Sub Division
Officer's Yadi No. 569, dated the 9th December 1896,
referred to by the Deputy Commissioner, containing
replies to the allegations made in the Petition
of Hyder Saib, a defaulting Toddy Veed
Farmer in the Holopet Sub taluk, for 1892-93.

2. The late Deputy Commissioner Mr. Moir
Shujait Ali Khan Saib's memo dated the
13th July 1894, on the accompanying file
shows.

shows that he personally investigated the complaint of Hyder Saib and recorded his opinion thereon. It would appear from his enquiry that Hyder Saib, being unable to manage his business, made no proper arrangements, and therefore suffered loss, and that he could not conveniently obtain Toddy from the trees assigned to him.

3. In regard to the Petitioner's complaint that the sales in his shops were affected by two shops Medumamahalli and Kegglahalli in the Kankanhalli taluk, having been opened in close proximity to his shops in the Belospet Sub. taluk, an endorsement was given to him so long ago as 4th August 1892 to the effect that the sales in the Kankanhalli taluk having taken place before those in the Belospet Sub. taluk, he was doubtless aware of the situation of the said shops in the Kankanhalli taluk at the time he bid for his shops in the Belospet taluk, and that his complaint is therefore rejected.

4. In regards to Hyder Saib's allegations of irregularities in the sale of his property for the arrears due by him, the Bhopet Sub Division Officer reports as follows: —

- (1) that the Pattalis of the sold lands were nominally in the names of others, but as the lands were really in the complainant Hyder Saib's possession and enjoyment, notices were duly served on him;
- (2) that the property was properly sold by the late Amildar Hounappah Naidu on the spot where it is situated;
- (3) that it appears that the property was not sold subject to the right title and interest of others;
- (4) that the amount realized by the sale of the property was Rs 442, of which Rs 346-12-0 has been recovered, leaving a balance of Rs 95-4-0;
- (5) that the amounts for which the lands and house were sold, are reasonable, and it appears that they cannot fetch more;

- (6) that some of the purchasers of the property appear to be the complainant's men; and
(7) that all the sold properties are in the possession and enjoyment of the complainant, and he appears to have been paying the assessment thereof.

See ^xHyder Saib's statement on the file.

5. The Sub Division Officer also states that the complainant has deposed ^xbefore him to the effect that if the amount of his loss were permitted, he would pay up the remainder.
6. The report of the Amildar of Kankanhalli, No. 165, dated the 27th October 1896, to the District Sub Division Officer, shows that the sum of Rs 346-12-00 received from the purchasers of the petitioner's properties is in deposit, that all the purchase-properties are still in the enjoyment of the defaulter Hyder Saib; and that the purchasers have been constantly complaining of the property not having been placed in their possession. The Deputy Commissioner has been requested to submit a detailed report on all the points of irregularities &c. noticed in the papers

papers on the accompanying file. A copy
of the reference to the Deputy Commissioner
on the subject, is herewith sent for infor-
mation.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant.

M. Puricutt

Excise Commissioner

MB in Mysore.

From.

The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore
Bangalore

Dated $\frac{6}{9}$ th January 1897

No. A. 265.

Enclosure 1 file

The Excise Commissioner's Nos.
 $\frac{2071}{123}$ and $\frac{2589}{140}$ dated 1st October
and 19th November 1896, requesting
that an enquiry may be made into
the points alleged in defaulter Hyder
Saib's petition.


In reply has the honor to state
that the Sub Division officer
of Chosepet States in his report No.
569 dated 9th December last that
the allegations made by the defaulter
are groundless and the Sale was properly
conducted by the then Amildar
Honnappa Haidu

Honnappa Naidu. The property was sold for Rs 442. of which 346-12-0 has been recovered and Rs 95-4-0 is still due.

2. Further, it has transpired that some of the bidders are closely related to the defaulter. Under these circumstances, the representation made by Hyder Saib is unworthy of attention.

(Signed) B. Coopposamy Naidu
For Deputy Commissioner

"Copy"


Excise Commissioner
 in Mysore

From
The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To
The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District

Dated 23rd January 1897.

No. 3961

The Deputy Commissioner's No. ¹⁹³ 265, dated the
6th instant
9th

In reply has the honor to request further
information on the following points:-

(1) The Harajpattys on the file
of Vernacular papers show that
for the lands Nos 129 and 291
of Gubbadi village, belonging
to defaulter Hyder Saib, there
were no bids above those of
Sarkar Saval. In whose possession
are these lands and who has
been paying the Kandayem there
of? Are there date trees on them

and

and if so how many?

(2) Did the purchasers of the defaulter's properties pay the purchase money within the stipulated time? By whom is Rs 95-4-6 still due, and how was the sale annulled when the balance of purchase money was not paid within fifteen days from the date of sale as per condition 3 of the Sale Notice

(3) How could "Some of the bidders be closely related to the defaulter" while all of them except Shaik Bandi Saib, the purchaser of the lands Nos. 39 and 42 of Mudanahalli, are Hindus? How is Shaik Bandi Saib related to him

(4) If some of the purchasers are
the

defaulters' men, as stated by the closepet Sub-division officer, it should be ascertained who they are, whether they are willing that the lands they purchased may remain in the defaulters' possession, and whether the money they paid and which is in deposit, may be credited to the arrears due by the defaulter. Their statements should be taken on all these points and submitted. Karasimmiah the purchaser of lands Nos. 139, 138, 143 and 150 of Madanahalli, petitioned the Jamabandzy officer of the Kankanhalli taluk on the 19th February 1896 requesting him to transfer the Puttah of the lands to his name. This man could not have purchased the lands on behalf of defaulter Hyder Saib.

(5) The Kanarese order no. 2 dated the 13th July 1895, issued to the above Karasimmiah, shows that the lands purchased

purchased by him were made over to him by the Amildar. Why has not Narasimmaiah taken possession of them, and why has he allowed them to remain in the defaulter's enjoyment? A statement should be taken from him on these points, and submitted.

(6) The sales which were held on the 30th December 1893, were confirmed by the Deputy Commissioner, so long ago as the 13th July 1894. Why were the lands not made over to the purchasers by the Amildar and why were they allowed to remain in the defaulter's possession?

(7) The petition presented to the Deputy Commissioner on the 15th September 1896, by the above purchaser Narasimmaiah complaining of the lands not having been made over to him and Khate' not

not transferred to him, contains the marks of Venkatappah and Shaik Bandi as other complainants on the same subject. Venkatappah does not seem to be the purchaser of any of the defaulters' property. Enquires if Shaik Bandi was present when the said petition was presented to the Deputy Commissioner by Narasimmaiah. If Shaik Bandi also really complained on the subject, then he could not be closely related to the defaulter.

8. The Amildar's report dated the 27th October 1896, shows that most of the purchase money of Rs 346-12-0 which is in deposit was received on the 26th January 1894, so that it was not received within fifteen days from the date of sale. This report also shows that all the lands whose sales were confirmed by the Deputy Commissioner

Commissioner in 1894, are still in the enjoyment of the defaulter Hyder Saib.

2.

The Deputy Commissioner is requested to be so good as to send early a detailed report on all the aforesaid points for submission to Government.

(Sd) J. K. Purnaiya

Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

"Copy"

J. K. Purnaiya

Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

From	
SECTION	Sd The Secretary
FILE No.	150/1895-6
SERIAL No.	8 To

The Encls. Commr.
in Mysore

Dated 3-2-97

Despatched 5

Received

General No. 6952
EX No. 274

Enclosure No. 8 22nd January/97

His letter No. $\frac{3960}{273}$ submitting
a report, with records, on the al-
legations made by Hyder Sahib,
defaulting Toddy Vend Farmer
of Chosepet Sub-Sahib for 92-93.

Adverting to para 6 of the
above, ~~stating that the Deputy
Commr. has been asked to
submit detailed information
on all the points of irregularities
noticed~~, has the honour to
request that ^{the} further report,

therein called for
~~after obtaining the requisites~~
information, may ^{obtain} be submitted
as early as possible. and to
~~state that such a report will~~
~~be awaited.~~

By Order


Secretary.

RD

30/1/97

1897 Ex No 2/89
10 FEB. 97

From

The, Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To

The Secretary to Govt. of Mysore.

SECTION	General, Revenue Dept 3
FILE No.	157/1895-96
SERIAL No.	7

Dated 6th February 1897.

Despatched 7th Do

Received

General No. 4/48

No. 285

Enclosure No.

In reply to Secretary's Docket No. 6952
dated the 3rd instant. Ex 274
SUBJECT.

Requests that the records relating to the case of Hyder Saib defaulting Toddy Vendi Taxmen of Chospet, Sub-taluk, for 1892-93 may be returned, as the Deputy Commissioner Bangalore District wants them for reference.

References (to be entered only in the
Dewan's Office.)

Rev 9-2-97

Ex 274
10/2

No. 4148
285

Excise Commissioner's Office,
Bangalore dated 6th February 1897.

From,

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To,

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

In reply to your docket No. $\frac{6952}{Ex 274}$,
dated the $\frac{3}{5}$ th instant, I have the honor to
request that the records relating to the
case of Hyder Saib, defaulting Toddy Vend
Farmer of Chospet Sub-taluk for 1892-93
may be returned, as the Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District wants them for reference.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant
M. M. M.


Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

Lo

SECTION	SA	The Excise Commr
FILE No.	15 of 13546	in Mysore
SERIAL No.	10	7297 in file
	EX: 288	
Dated 12 February 1897		
15		

His no $\frac{4148}{285}$ of the
6th Insulant requesting the
return of the ~~file~~ ^{records} relating
to the case of Hyder Sab
defaulting Zaddy Vaud Farmer
of the Chise-pet Sub - Taluk
for 1892-93.

Has the honor to return
the ~~file~~ ^{records} referred to above.

"By Order"

Secretary
20/12

1897

From

The Excise Commissions
in Mysore

To

The Secretary to Govt. of Mysore.

SECTION	General Revenue Dept. S
FILE No.	159/1898-6
SERIAL No.	11
Dated 2 September 1897	

Despatched 18

Received

General No. 2628

No. 125-

Enclosure No. 3 + 1 file

In reply to Secretary's docket No.
6952 dated 31st February 1897
Ex 274 SUBJECT.

Submits further report
in the case of Hyder Saib
Toddy Vendor Farmer
Shannangal Firkha
Hospet sub. Taluk.

References (to be entered only in the
Dewan's Office.)

Rev. 20/9/97

22/9/97.

Reference
22/9/97

Submitted with memo

Continued, with reference to Secy's order
dated 22nd September 1896
22/9/97 25/9/97

N^o. $\frac{2628}{125}$ Enc: 3 & 1 file

Excise Commissioners Office
Bangalore dated 8th September 1897.

From,

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To,

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

In reply to your docket N^o. $\frac{6952}{Ex 274}$
dated the 3rd February 1897, I have the honor
to submit, herewith, copy of docket N^o. A 64,
dated 6th instant, from the Deputy Commissioner
in Bangalore District, together with a copy
of the Kankanhalli taluk Amildar's
Memo, therewith received, giving replies to
my questions in my docket N^o. $\frac{3961}{193}$, dated
23rd January 1897, to the Deputy Commissioner.
It will be seen that the purchasers failed
to pay the purchase money within the
stipulated time, and yet the Deputy
Commissioner confirmed the Sales; but
that the whole of the property which was
sold, is in the defaulter Hyder Saib's
possession

possession. I am of opinion that as the sale confirmation, was irregular because payment, was not made in time, the sale should be cancelled as null and void, and the re-sale thereof should be ordered, if the defaulter persists, in not paying up the arrears due by him. I also am inclined to think that, if the sale, was genuine, the purchasers after paying up the money would not have remained practically inactive, without obtaining possession of and enjoying the lands they purchased. They have complained, after a distant interval of time, and the reason given by the Taluk authorities, is the non-receipt of records from District Office. This reason could scarcely be accepted.

2. The file of vernacular papers received from the Deputy Commissioner, is herewith sent for reference and return.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

M. J. S. S.

Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

1897-98

From

The Deputy Commissioner
of the Bangalore District.

To,

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

Dated 6th September 1897

No. A 64

Enclosure 1 File

His docket No. $\frac{3961}{193}$ dated the 23rd January 1897 calling for some information in regard to the sale of the lands of Hyder Salih for the Toddy contract amount due from him to the Chospet Sub. Taluk.

Has the honor to forward herewith a Memorandum by the Amildar of Kankhal Taluk giving all the details wanted in the above.

2. The vernacular record of the case received with his docket No. $\frac{4372}{211}$ of the 17th February 1897 is herewith returned.

(Signed) B. K. Venkatvardiengar

Deputy Commissioner

"Copy"

[Signature]

Excise Commissioner

in Mysore

With reference to Bospet Sub Division Officer's order No. 313 dated 12th March 1897 the following questions with regard to the sale of lands belonging to Mideindalli Hyder Saib, Toddy contractor, Shanmangal Firka, Bospet Sub Taluk, in satisfaction of arrears due by him, have been answered in juxtaposition.

Questions	Answers.
I. The Sale list, in the file of vernacular papers show that for the lands Nos. 129 & 291 of Gabbadi village, be. of Gabbadi village on the belonging to defaulter Hyder Saib there were no bids too far from the village to above those of Government cultivate and that over bid. In whose possession account of large amount are these lands and who of assessment for Rs. 291 has been paying the and as there was not enough Kandyam thereof? of water in the tank to Are there date trees on irrigate it, and as there them, and if so how many? were two partners for the same piece. No. 129 is in the possession of Hyder Saib and No. 291 in those of both Hyder Saib & Mallegowda,	

There are 10 date trees
in No. 129 and none in 291.

II Did the purchasers of the defaulter's property pay the purchase money within the stipulated time? By whom is Rs 95-4-6 still due and how was the Sale confirmed when the balance of purchase money was not paid within 15 days from the date of Sale as per Condition 3 of the Sale Notice?

II. No, they did not pay within the stipulated time, but it was remitted to the Treasury as follows:-

Rs 78-12-	
8-1-94.	31-12-
26-1-94.	236-4-
Total 346-12-	

As the defaulter's wife and Concubine brought some Complaint against the Sale and the then officials did not demand for the arrears it was received 10 days later than the stipulated time. The balance of Rs 95-4- is still due as follows:-

Rs 90-"" from Mallegowda
of Gabbadi and
Rs 5-4- from Narasimha
-reddy
Rs 95-4-"

The sale was confirmed by the Deputy Commissioner on the submission of Urree No. 131 of 8-9-94 from the
Deputy

soliciting sanction before be
submitting the records from ds.
this Taluk with particulars
of Sale. The balance of
Rs 95-4-0 is still due as no
demand was made by the
then Officials and as Hyder
Saib and others made
objection to the effect that
the lands were sold for low
prices and as the property
has not as yet been made
over to the purchaser.

III. How could some of the
bidders be closely related
to the defaulter when all
of them except Shaik Baudi
the purchaser of the lands
nos 39 and 42 of Mudehalli
are Hindoos? How is Shaik
Baudi Saib related to him?

IV. The purchasers do not
appear to be defaulter's
men and they are neither
willing to leave the lands
they purchased in defaulter's
possession nor to credit the
lands

Sale

... of purchased may be taken from the arrears due
remain in defaulter's possession and whether the money they paid and which is in deposit may be credited to the arrears due by the defaulter. Their Statements should be taken on all these points and submitted. Karasimhaya the purchaser of lands Nos 139, 138, 143 & 150 of Midehalli who petitioned the Jamabandi Officer of the Kankanhalli Taluk for the transfer of Patta of these lands, deposes that the lands were purchased of Midehalli on his own behalf.

the Jamabandi Officer of the Kankanhalli Taluk on the 9th February 1896 requesting him to transfer the Patta of the lands to his name. This man could not have purchased the lands on behalf of defaulter Hyder Saib

V. The Kanarese Order No 2 dated the 13th July 1895 in the enjoyment of the lands issued to the above Karasimhaya shows that the arrears and would not in lands purchased by him any way leave them to the were made over to him purchaser's possession, by Karasimhaya

by the Amildar. Why has Karsimhaya was not able
not. Karsimhaya taken to take possession of the lands
possession of them and why. Karsimhaya's statement
has he allowed them to is herewith submitted.
remain in the defaulter's
enjoyment? A Statement
should be taken from him
on these points and submitted

VI. The sale which was held on 30th December 1893, was confirmed by the Deputy Commissioner so long ago as the 30th July 1894. Why were the lands not made over to the purchaser by the Amildar and why were they allowed to remain in the defaulter's possession?

VI. Because the file of correspondence was not sent to Taluk from the Deputy Commissioner's Office as the 30th July 1894. Why were for reference in order to issue orders to make over the lands to the purchasers. The lands have still been in the enjoyment of defaulter from the time of confiscation. Paddy Inspector Kallyah says that he did not make over the confiscated property to any village officials at the time of attachment and that he does not know further particulars. As Kallyah left the confiscated lands

lands in the possession and enjoyment of the defaulter they could not be made over to the purchaser.

VII. The petition presented to the Deputy Commissioner on the 15th September 1896 by the above purchaser. Narsimha present when the petition complaining of the lands not having been made over to him and Khate not transferred to him, contains the mark of Venkatappa and Shaik Bandi as other complainants on the same subject. Venkatappa does not seem to be the purchaser of any of the defaulter's property. Enquires if Shaik Bandi was present when the said petition was presented to the Deputy Commissioner by Narsimha. If Shaik Bandi also complained on the subject then he could not be closely related to the defaulter.

VIII. Venkatappa and Shaik Bandy the purchaser of the defaulter's house which was subsequently sold to him by the said Narsimha. Shaik Bandy does not appear to be on good terms with Hyder Saib although he is closely related to him.

VII. The Amildar's report dated 27 October 1896 shows that most of the purchase money of Rs 346-12-0 which is in deposit was received on the 26 January 1894, so that it was not received within 15 days from the date of sale. This report also shows that all the lands whose sales were confirmed by the Deputy Commissioner in 1894 are still in the enjoyment of the defaulter Hyder Saib.

VIII. All the lands are still in the enjoyment of defaulter owing to the non receipt of the file of correspondence from the Deputy Commissioner's office and to the fact of the lands not having been made over to the purchaser. They were left in the possession of the defaulter at the time of attachment.

The file of correspondence is herewith submitted.

Kankanhally }
30 August 1897 }

(Signed)

Amildar

"Copy"

M. M. M. M.

Excise Commissioner

Mysore

Prop of the Govt: of Mysore

SECTION	<u>SA</u>
FILE No.	<u>159</u> <u>1895-96</u>
SERIAL No.	<u>12</u>

Read:-
Petition Regd No: 1686 of 4th
November 1895 from Hyder Sahab,
defaulting Toddy Vend Farmer of
the Syanamangala Circle in the
Closepet Sub-Taluk for 92-93, com-
-plaining against the order of the
Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore
District and praying that the sale
of his properties, irregularly
conducted under the orders of
the Deputy Commr. for the arrears
of Toddy Revenue due from him,
may be directed to be set aside.

2. Correspondence ending with
letter No. 2628 of 8th September
125
1897 from The Concise Commr
in Mysore submitting a report
with records on the several
allegations made ~~in the above~~
~~petition~~. by the petitioner in
the matter

✓
7222-3

Barbo

21/2/38

ca: ans file of r.s.

Order

Order Thereon :-

From the ~~above~~ records, ~~subd~~ by the Excise Commr. it is ^{clear} ~~observed~~ that the properties of Hyder Sahab were sold in satisfaction of the arrears due by him free of all encumbrances ^{tho' in} ~~In~~ a case like this, ^{how can} only ^{see} the right, title and interest of the defaulter, ~~can be sold under~~ the rules in force. ^{As however, the} ~~Further the~~ purchasers did not pay up the balance of the purchase money within the time fixed; Government are ~~therefore~~ pleased to direct the cancellation of the sale ~~thus con-~~ ducted, referred to.

2. ^{As it is admitted} ~~The Deputy Commissioner~~ ~~admits~~ that Hyder Sahab foolishly ran up the bid and purchased the farm for a much higher price than it was worth and that the local authorities could not remove the difficulties thrown in the petitioner's way by one Nanjunda Gowda, the Excise Commissioner is requested


to ascertain the extent of loss sus-
-tained by the petitioner ~~for the~~
~~above reasons~~ and to submit a
remission statement accordingly
for the orders of Government. For
the balance, if any, the necessary
proceedings should be taken de novo

AB
26/1/98
To

Wm. 27-1-98
r Secretary

The Excise Commissioners in
Mysore with vernacular records

The Comptroller, Mysore Govt.



From

*Deputy Commissioner
in Mysore*

To

The Secretary to Govt. of Mysore.

SECTION	<i>SA</i>	<i>General Revenue Dept</i>
FILE No.	<i>15 of 1898-96</i>	
SERIAL No.	<i>13</i>	

Dated *28th June 1898*.

Despatched *29*

Received

General No. *8838*

No. *543*

Enclosure No. *1*

Remission

In reply to Secretary's reminder No. *8285*, dated *5th March 1898*.
Ex 320 SUBJECT.

Submits a Remission Statement received from the Deputy Commissioner Bangalore District of Rs 486-12-0, being the amount actual loss reported to have been sustained by Hyder Saib, Goddy, Vendi Grammer of the Syamangal Zirkha of the Bloo-pet Sub-tah.

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office.)

5/7/98

W. H. H.

Subd. with d/o

Re

30.6.90

5/7/98

L. & Co. Commissioners' Office
 Bangalore 28th June 1898
 29

The Excise Commissioner
in response

Sir,

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient servant

Neu-Kata-Kanzler
Gordexice-Kommissionen
in Luzern

Statement showing the amount of the Arrears of Rental recommended for Remission

Farm No.	Name of Farm	Name of Farmer (defaulter)	Amount of original bid including local cess if any		Date of resale	Amount recovered or adjusted up to date of resale			Arrears due on date of resale	Amount of full khists still due from date of resale up to close of original lease
			Per month	Per annum		By monthly khist	By distress of goods, &c.	Total		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
	Syanamangala Zirka	Hyder Ali	103 1/2	1236 1/2	Sub. sold	450	-	450		

Sd/-
Bates Bangalore
27/4 June 1898.

Cal

in the Taluk of Chorepet in the Bangalore District for the year 1892-93

Serial	Total amount due from farmer towards original bid	Deduction		Balance irrecoverable and recommended for remission			Name of farmer who purchased at resale	Remarks
		Adjustment from security deposits, &c.	Amount realized by resale	Total amount	On account of arrears	On account of loss by resale		
12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
	786 1/2			786 1/2		786 1/2		This statement issues as per Govt. Proceedings No. 7222-3 dated 1st February 1898. The same Contractor Hyder Ali having sustained loss to the extent of Rs 786-12-0 this remission is recommended.

Subdarangar
Deputy Commissioner

Read:-

SECTION 100
FILE No. 15918
SERIAL No. 14

6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529

Submitting, with reference to Govt: Prop

No: $\frac{7222.3}{8 \times 260}$ of February, 1898, a

Remission Statement for Rs 786-12-4,
being the amount of actual loss
reported to have been sustained by
Hyder Sahab, 20th Kend Farmer of
Syanamangula Fiska, Klosepet Sub,
Taluk, for the year 92-93.

Order Number No: 253-6 8 4/2/98
Ru 20

The sum of Rs 786-12-0 above
referred to will be ~~credited~~ ^{written off}
the accounts.

82
6/7/92

u
6/7/90

ll.
9-7-96
Secretary

The incise former in paper
or Comptroller, paper lost,